DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 417 IR 055 056

AUTHOR Santos, Mary Jane
TITLE An Examination of Standardized Evaluation Forms Used in Public Libraries To Evaluate Professional Librarians.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 39p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Librarians; *Library Administration; Library Surveys; *Personnel Evaluation; Professional Development; *Public Libraries; Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS *Management Skills; Standardization; *Standardized Assessment System

ABSTRACT

Professional librarians working in public libraries are generally evaluated in a number of ways, including standardized forms. By collecting and studying these forms, it was proposed that certain management traits and behaviors could be identified and compared. A total of 115 libraries serving municipalities with populations of more than 50,000 were identified. Each was asked to provide copies of blank standardized evaluation forms, along with basic information about the library and its process of evaluation. Forty-four library directors returned the survey, some evaluations, or both; and 40 supplied only the evaluation forms, a response rate of 35 percent. A large majority used standardized evaluation forms. Most evaluations were annual, and most were performed by the immediate supervisor. The size of the library was not reflected in these statistics. Analyzing the forms identified the following seven basic management skills: (1) planning; (2) organizing; (3) staffing; (4) directing; (5) coordinating; (6) reporting; and (7) budgeting. Not all management skills were evaluated at all libraries, and the diversity makes it impossible to determine if library administrators are consistently concerned with the management skills of their staffs. Two tables list the skills identified and the types of questions on evaluation forms. Five appendixes contain the survey and other letters used to conduct the survey. (Contains 26 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 417

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An Examination of Standardized Evaluation Forms Used in Public Libraries to Evaluate Professional Librarians

Professional Librarians working in public libraries are generally evaluated in a number of ways, including standardized forms. By collecting and studying those standardized forms, it is proposed that certain management traits and behaviors can be identified, summarized, compared and contrasted. This research has identified 99 libraries serving municipalities of 50,000+. It is proposed that each of these libraries will be asked to provide copies of blank standardized evaluation forms, along with basic information about the library and its process of evaluation. Certain traits and behaviors will be identified, recorded and analyzed in an attempt to identify those managerial qualities required of the librarians and libraries surveyed.

IR055052

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Jane Santos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Master's Research Paper by

Mary Jane Santos

B.S. Bowling Green State University, 1992

Approved by

Adviser _____ Date 11-18-92

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the directors of the libraries who responded to this survey, making this research possible; my advisor for this project, Dr. Richard Rubin for all his help and wise counsel; Director Patricia Ebbatson of the Delaware County District Library who served as my mentor and inspiration; and my family who supported me with their patience and understanding.

APPENDIX D

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Request for Approval of Research Paper Topic

Student: Mary Jane Santos Date: July 30, 1992

Paper Title: An Examination of Standardized Evaluation Forms Used in Public Libraries to Evaluate Professional Librarians

Graduation Date: December, 1992

Brief description: (100 words)
(Also attach a detailed statement of plan and procedure, with account of literature search already carried out.)
Professional librarians working in public libraries are generally evaluated in a number of ways, including standardized forms. By collecting and studying those forms, it is proposed that certain management traits and behaviors can be identified, summarized, compared and contrasted. This research has identified 99 libraries serving municipalities of 50,000+. It is proposed that each of these libraries will be asked to provide copies of blank standardized evaluation forms, along with basic information about the library and its process of evaluation. Certain traits and behaviors will be identified, recorded and analyzed in an attempt to identify those managerial qualities required of librarians and libraries surveyed.

Action and comments by research paper adviser:

✓ approved ____ not approved Signed: [signature] Date: 8-10-92

Action and comments by Dean:

✓ approved ____ not approved Signed: [signature] Date: 8-10-92

Topics must be formally submitted for approval at certain deadline points in advance of commencement date, and the final paper must also meet a prescribed deadline. The dates are given on p. 4 of the attached "Guide."

Introduction

Professional librarians are evaluated by a variety of evaluation forms. By analyzing a sample of these forms used in public libraries serving municipalities whose population is 50,000+ throughout the United States, it is proposed that certain common management traits and behaviors may be identified, summarized, compared and contrasted.

This study focuses on identifying, summarizing, and analyzing those common management traits and skills that are being evaluated in professional librarians. Stueart and Moran have identified seven management skills which serve as the foundation for the management skills studied in this paper. These skills are planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.[1] As a corollary to this study of these management skills, these data will be compared with research in the management and social science literature on effective evaluation, to attempt to determine if library administrators are concerned with the management skills of their professionals as reflected in performance evaluation forms.

Background

What is performance evaluation? According to the *American Library Association (ALA) Glossary of Library and Information Science*, performance evaluation is defined as "the process of evaluating performance and behavior of employees individually in their positions for purposes of assessing training needs and determining eligibility for retention, salary adjustment or promotions."[2] Performance appraisal in this sense is synonymous with performance evaluation and employee evaluation. Rubin defines performance evaluation as "a period of time set aside by supervisor and employee for the discussion and written assessment of the employee's work performance,"[3] and in a broader sense, "performance is any assessment of an employees's performance."[4] Herbert White states, "performance evaluation is an essential part of effective personnel administration," and should be an important part of the library's value system.[5]

Indeed, performance evaluation has been a part of public libraries for many years. Until the early 1970s, the ALA distributed a preprinted form for evaluation of all library staff, consisting of a list of personality traits along with a grid ranging from unsatisfactory to excellent for easy check-off by a supervisor.[6] Twenty years ago, in 1972, it was reported that 95% of libraries used some form of performance appraisal system.[7] However, library management soon began to realize that universal performance appraisal forms such as the ALA's did not always serve the needs of the individual public libraries, and that appraisals and service performance standards needed "to be developed locally to meet the demands of the local situation."[8] These demands were oftentimes linked to the public libraries goals as stated in its mission; therefore, if library managers and employees were to be productive

and supportive of these goals, they must have an "accurate understanding of their contribution towards the...mission,"[9] which in part was achieved through the process of a localized performance evaluation form.

What exactly, then, is the purpose of a performance evaluation? Is a performance evaluation's only goal to allow professional employees to gain understanding of the public library? One very basic purpose of a performance evaluation in a public library is to evaluate the public library itself. Most public libraries are primarily non-profit, service organizations, and unlike profit-making organizations, non-profit institutions such as public libraries offer no earnings or profits to act as a yardstick by which success can be measured. While there may be assorted output statistics that are used in measuring the effectiveness of libraries and library service, it is equally important, necessary, and effective to evaluate "the performance of those engaged in providing service if the library is to measure performance at all."[10]

While performance evaluations may be valuable for measuring the success of a public library as a whole, their greater value probably lies in the more specific purpose of the evaluation of individual employees, professional and non-professional. As with any management process, the process of performance evaluation has many different variations such as trait-based systems, effectiveness-based systems, Behaviorially-Based Rating System (BARS), and Management-by-Objectives system (MBO), to mention only a few.[11,12] Much information and detailed explanations can be found on each of these varieties of performance evaluations, but this study is concerned more with the standards themselves as reflected in the performance evaluation forms. It should be mentioned, however, that the "plethora of evaluation methods highlights the fact that there is no one way to conduct a performance evaluation."[13] As with any management function, many advantages and disadvantages to performance evaluation of employees have been addressed in both library and non-library management literature. Among the advantages of performance evaluation are the following:

1. Creates and maintains satisfactory levels of performance, when "satisfactory" is adequately defined for both library management and professional.
2. Indicates areas for needed or potential growth and development.
3. Forces the manager to take some interest in the work of the subordinate.
4. Provides a guide to job changes.
5. Provides a guide for fair wage and salary administration.
6. Forces managers and employees to assess their place in the library.
7. Provides an outlet for examination of an employee's commitment to his/her job.
8. Provides employees an opportunity to set new personal and professional goals.

9. Provides an opportunity to determine the employees's interest in advancement.
10. Provides feedback to create programs that may ensure higher productivity.
11. Creates a climate through clear communication channels which fosters personal and professional growth.
12. Ensures employee understanding of required level of performance.
13. Informs employees of the quality of work.
14. Provides recognition for outstanding performance.
15. Identifies library deficiencies.
16. Fosters employee motivation.
17. Aids in personnel decisions.
18. Helps create more effective training programs for employees.
19. Fosters better utilization of the library's resources,[14,15,16,17,18]

The following are among the disadvantages associated with performance evaluation:

1. Often is done sketchily, hypocritically and meaninglessly with no regard for profession or personal growth of employees.
2. May be a thinly disguised rationalization for salary and promotional decisions already made.
3. Does not always recognize the differences between library managers and employees regarding the practice of performance evaluation.
4. Does not always accurately measure growth of employee.
5. May measure only past performance with no emphasis on future goals.
6. May create employee resentment and non-productivity.[19, 20, 21, 22]

While the variety of performance evaluation forms may seem nearly infinite, and while the number of advantages and disadvantages associated with performance evaluation itself may indicate little if any agreement among the library community on this issue, there are, nevertheless, many areas of agreement in the literature regarding the prerequisites of any performance evaluation. By meeting these prerequisites library administrators (management) may avoid or mitigate many of the difficulties or disadvantages associated with performance evaluations.

Rubin lists four prerequisites to effective performance evaluation:

1. written policies and procedures
2. written job descriptions
3. performance evaluation forms
4. training programs.[23]

Along with these prerequisites, undoubtedly the evaluative terms used in performance evaluation forms must be well-defined and clearly understood by both administration and professional employee. Terms such as "excellent" and "average" are only rubber yardstick, and "there must be shared meanings for the criteria used to arrive at these terms."[24, 25]

The performance appraisal should also be integrated with the library's goals,[26] and the professional being evaluated should know how his/her evaluation fits into the organization. It is vitally important for management to realize that any performance evaluation system is fallible and that no system of employee evaluation is the best, perfect or objective.[27]

Performance evaluations, regardless of form, should also be an informal, ongoing process, with information on the professional employee gathered through personnel records, interviews, and day-to-day communication, culminating in a more formal annual or semi-annual review, which, while evaluating past performance, should have a clear view of future expectations.[28] It is also generally agreed upon that both management and employees desire "factual and honest appraisals"[29] of their performance.

Review of Literature

It is obvious that there is a great deal of common ground to be found regarding performance appraisal, its value and importance, in spite of its advantages and disadvantages enumerated here; however, while performance appraisal may be a generally agreed on and utilized process in libraries and other institutions, have the standardized forms associated with this process been gathered and analyzed for the specific management traits and behaviors they attempt to evaluate? What, if any previous research has been done in this area, specifically in the field of library and information science, to be built upon, supported or refuted by this present study?

In February, 1979, a survey was done by Nancy Patton Van Zant in her study of personnel policies. A questionnaire was mailed to 1300 public and 1000 academic libraries in the United States (no information was available on how these libraries were selected). Van Zant's study was aimed primarily at gathering and studying personnel policies; however, part of this questionnaire addressed the existence and implementation of performance evaluations. Van Zant found that of the 197 reporting public libraries serving 100,000+ population, 91.3% (180) did indeed give performance evaluations, and most often these evaluations were used for self-improvement, salary raises and/or dismissals. The most frequent interval of performance reviews was annually, and supervisors most often were the conductors of these performance evaluations.[30] In her survey, however, Van Zant did not address the mechanics of or forms used in these performance evaluations, nor was that the primary purpose of her study. Her research does illuminate the fact that the majority of those public libraries responding did utilize a performance appraisal system of

some type.

A more recent study (1990) was conducted by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), the purpose of which was to "collect data on current practices regarding performance appraisals in academic libraries for librarians and support staff."[31] While this study was quite comprehensive in its treatment of performance appraisals, its sample was 250 academic libraries, making comparisons to the present study are less valuable. This study did, however, identify several traits of professional academic librarians that were evaluated: performance, communication, interpersonal skills, professional skills, supervisory skills, resourcefulness, and service to the institution.[32] Many of these traits are similar to the ones that this study identified from its collected data. It also should be noted that the ACRL study was instrumental in providing a basis for the format for the present research.

If additional studies have been accomplished which might be influenced or replicated by this study, extensive research in the LISA, ERIC, Library Literature, Psych Lit, InfoTrac, Magazine Index and *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* databases has not revealed it. Also searched were the online catalogs of Delaware County District Library, Ohio Wesleyan University Library, and Ohio State University Library. It appears through this lack of reported information on the examination and analysis of standardized performance evaluation forms used in public libraries that the purpose of this study is justified. Indeed, no research could be found which in any way attempted to fill this gap in the literature on the analysis of forms used in performance evaluations of professional librarians in public libraries serving municipalities of 50,000+. Those studies previously completed seemed to concentrate on a) academic libraries, or b) personnel policies as a whole in public and academic libraries.

Objectives

The purpose of this research paper was to identify, summarize, compare and contrast common management traits and behavior that are the focal point of evaluation forms used to evaluate professional librarians in public libraries serving municipalities of 50,000+ throughout the United States. This research paper proposed several objectives:

1. What are the management skills and types of behavior being evaluated by standardized forms in professional librarians in public libraries? Some of the variables expected to be present in these forms and, therefore, expected to be studied are the following:

    a. planning skills
    b. organizational skills
    c. staffing skills
    d. directing skills
    e. coordinating skills
    f. reporting skills
    g. budgeting skills

2. What is the average length of the evaluation form used to evaluate professionals?
3. What types of statements or questions are found on the evaluation forms? Are these questions/statements open-ended, lending themselves to communication between the evaluator and the evaluated? Are these questions/statements of the "yes and no" type? Or is some sort of graphic rating scale being used?
4. What is/are the format(s) that is/are being used in these evaluations?
5. How do the results of the analysis of this survey compare with the previously published research?
6. What implications can be drawn from this study regarding current and future evaluations in public libraries?

Definitions

For the purposes of this research paper, the following definitions will be used:

1. Public library -- a library serving the general public that is supported by and/or financed by public funds, serving 50,000+ people, as determined by the *American Library Association Directory of Libraries.*
2. Evaluation form -- a standardized form used by administration or superiors to assess professional librarians.
3. Professional librarian -- an employee of a public library possessing a Masters of Library Science from an accredited-American Library Association institution, or performing a job that requires the Masters of Library Science.

4. Management skills -- skills used by librarians in the performance of their managerial duties: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting, as defined in *Library Management* by Robert D. Stueart and Barbara B. Moran.

Methodology

The proposed national sample was drawn from the *American Library Association Directory of Libraries 1991*. Only those public libraries in the United States that serve a population of 50,000+ were included. A sample was drawn selecting two libraries from each state, with the exception of Hawaii. (Hawaii has only one library system in the state and it services the entire state through multiple branches; therefore, only one library was chosen for the survey.) The names of the chosen libraries are listed for each state in Appendix I.

A letter was mailed to the director of each public library selected. This letter asked the director if a standardized form is used to evaluate professional librarians in the library. If so, the director was asked to complete a brief survey with questions regarding the frequency of evaluation, number of professionals on staff, who conducts the evaluations, and if an interview accompanies the evaluation process. Additionally, the director was requested to send a blank copy of the evaluation form(s) currently being used in the library to be analyzed and studied. (See Appendix II.) In the event that the chosen library did not employ standardized evaluation forms, another library was randomly selected from the already chosen sample list, and the subsequent steps were repeated. These additional libraries surveyed are also listed in Appendix I. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included in the mailed packet to attempt to increase response rate.

The results of this survey are obviously limited by the number of libraries that respond to it. A minimum number of 50 returned surveys was considered desirable to increase the validity of this study. The reliability factor of this study was affected by the reliability of those directors who chose to complete and return the surveys, as well as those directors who chose not to do so. There was also an attempt to control the reliability of this study by careful recording and analysis of the information gathered by this research.

Once the data were collected, analysis began. The following management traits were identified as being evaluated in professional librarians by their superiors:

planning skills
organizing skills
staffing skills
directing skills
coordinating skills
reporting skills
budgeting skills

The appearance of these traits on the evaluation forms was recorded using a simple coding technique, where 1=planning, 2=organizing, etc. (See Appendix III.) Additional traits not listed here were added as they appeared in the evaluations. Data were

gathered from the preliminary letter, with the answers to the questions posed in the letter recorded in a similar technique. The answers to the questions were analyzed to illuminate how the procedure of evaluation was performed. The information gathered from this study regarding the management skills and behaviors evaluated in professional librarians in public libraries serving a population of 50,000+ was then identified, summarized, compared and contrasted to form a clearer idea of the management skills evaluated for professional librarians employed by those libraries.

Data Analysis

Originally 99 libraries were surveyed; however, the total was increased to 115 in an effort to increase the number of responses. Overall, 58% (67/115) of those directors surveyed responded in some form. Twenty-six or 44% of the respondents indicated that their library system did not employ a standardized form to evaluate professional librarians. Of the 115 library directors, 44 actually returned either the survey form, sample evaluations, or both, a response rate of 38%. Forty directors supplied the standardized evaluation forms only. This return represents a 35% response rate, slightly less than anticipated, but nevertheless, a workable figure.

The survey and the summarized data can be found in Appendix V. A brief discussion of these data is necessary to substantiate this study's conclusions and implications.

The data revealed that a large majority of respondents use standardized evaluation forms. In response to the first question on the form concerning the use of standardized forms, 95% (42/44) responded that they did, in fact, utilize standardized forms to evaluate professional librarians; 5% (2/44) did not respond to this question.

The number of professional librarians employed by the respondents varied greatly, but most were relatively small: 50% employ 10 or less librarians. The range was 158. The mean number of employees was 23.24 and the median was 10.

Information gathered by this survey also indicated that most evaluations were done most often annually. The majority of directors (77%, 34/44) responded that the evaluations were done annually. Six respondents (14%) reported that their libraries performed semi-annual reviews. Occasionally, such comments as "annually after the first year of employment" and "semi-annually for new employees and then annually" were added. To facilitate this study, evaluations in probationary periods (the first year of employment) were not considered.

Responses to the survey showed that by and large, the immediate supervisor was responsible for employee evaluation. The librarian's immediate supervisor conducted the performance appraisal 77% of the time (34/44), with the library directors evaluating librarians 50% of the time (22/44). The size of the library was not reflected in these statistics. Directors were instructed to "check as many as apply," resulting in more than 100% response to this question. In

the "Other" category for this question were listed "Library Board" and "Assistant Director."

When the performance evaluations were conducted, most involved an interview. Ninety-five percent (42/44) indicated that interviews were involved; 5% did not respond to the question.

Evaluation of Forms

Examination of the forms submitted revealed that many librarians are evaluated with the standardized forms used by the library's governing body (township, city, county, for example). In this study, 50% (20 out of 40) forms were library-specific, 45% (18 out of 40) were non-library-specific, and 5% (2 out of 40) could not be categorized as either. A total of 40 evaluation forms were examined and studied for management skills.

In analyzing these forms, seven management skills were identified: planning organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. Of course, these forms did not always use the exact terminology listed here, and many terms used in these forms were adapted to fit this study. When available, the definitions supplied on the forms themselves were used to compare terms. If definitions were not available, the judgment of the researcher was used to categorize and record comparable terms. For the purposes of this study, the following list of synonymous terms was adapted:

organizing	time utilization: use of time
staffing	personnel management; development of other; training; teamwork orientation
directing	leadership; judgement; decision-making; motivating; innovation
coordination	problem-solving; analytical skills; delegating; controlling; creative thinking
reporting	documentation
budgeting	resource management; use of resources

There was no synonymous term used for "planning."

In addition to the terms listed here, "communication skills" was found to be a prominent management skill evaluated on the examined standardized forms; therefore, this term was added to the original seven terms. "Communication skills" is not synonymous with "reporting" as this term was defined as "keeping those to whom the librarian is responsible informed through records, research and inspection." No mention is made as to the quality of those reports. "Communication skills" as used here refers to the ability to communicate clearly and concisely, both in writing and verbally.

In the 40 standardized evaluation forms examined, the following chart summarizes the skills identified and the number and per cent of those skills that were found in the forms:

Table 1.
Number and Percent of Skills Identified in Performance Evaluation Forms

SKILLS	#LISTING	%LISTING
Planning	25	63
Organizing	24	60
Staffing	30	75
Directing	27	68
Coordinating	18	45
Reporting	15	37
Budgeting	12	30
Communication	25	63

Staffing, the bringing in and training of staff and the maintaining favorable conditions for work, was evident as a management skill in 75% (30/40) of the forms examined. Those librarians who are in management positions are evidently responsible for the supervising of subordinate staff in at least 75% of those libraries supplying evaluation forms. Conversely, staffing as a management skill was not evident in 25% (10/40) of the forms analyzed, indicating that, at least for these 10 libraries, staffing is not considered as a management skill.

Directing, the ability to make decisions, embody them in specific and general orders and instructions and serve as a leader was identified on 68% of the standardized forms analyzed. However, approximately one out of every three libraries surveyed (32%) did not list directing as a management skill that was evaluated in professional librarians.

Those evaluating professional librarians are also concerned with their planning ability a evidenced by the appearance of planning as an evaluative criteria in 63% of the forms examined. Additionally, communication skills, a management trait not initially included in this study, were found to be a skill that was evaluated in 63% of the forms surveyed. Although the abilities to plan and to communicate were identified on 63% of forms analyzed, these management skills were not included in more than a third of the forms studied (37%).

Sixty percent of the forms analyzed identified the ability to organize as a management trait that was evaluated in professional librarians. Forty percent (16/40) of the forms analyzed did not list the ability to organize as a management skill.

Of lesser importance as management traits were the ability to coordinate, report and budget. Coordination, the interrelating of the various parts of the work, may be a management trait that was less obvious to link with a synonym; therefore, it may be less prominent as a management trait simply because it is a nebulous term

and difficult to categorize if subtly stated. The management skill of coordinating was identified in less than 50% of those forms analyzed (45%). This management skill was not identified in more than half of the forms analyzed (55%; 22/40).

It was somewhat surprising to find the management skill of reporting present on only 38% of those forms studied. While reporting was not considered to be synonymous with communication skills because, for this study, reporting to supervision was defined as "keeping those to whom the librarian is responsible informed through records, research and inspection," this definition does not specify as to the quality of those reports, or to the communication skills required to report clearly and concisely to one's supervisors.

Budgeting was an evaluated management skill in only 30% of those forms analyzed. Seventy percent (28/40) did not list the management of budget or fiscal responsibility as a trait that was evaluated in professional librarians.

Format of Evaluation Forms

The average length of the evaluation forms examined was approximately 5 pages, with the actual number of pages ranging from 2 to 19. The median number of pages was 4. One library director reported that the form used by his/her library was a professionally prepared, proprietary form, unavailable for distribution. He/she did, however, send the evaluative criteria used in performance appraisal. It may also be of interest to note that one of the forms sent was copyrighted, with a $30.00 fee attached to its use by anyone other than the owner of the copyright. That fee, however, was waived for this study.

The types of questions that were asked tended to fit into three categories; open-ended, yes & no, graphic rating scales. A combination of these types of questions were also represented, such as a graphic rating scale with open-ended questions and yes & no type questions on a graphic rating scale. Every form examined made space available for comments from the evaluator. Refer to Table II for statistical information regarding the types of questions on the appraisal forms.

Table II.

Types of Questions on Forms

TYPE OF QUESTIONS	# OF RESPONSES	% OF RESPONSES
A	2	5
B	0	0
C	25	63
A & B	0	0
A & C	10	25
B & C	3	8
A & B & C	0	0

A=Open Ended Questions B=Yes & No Questions C=Graphic Rating

The formats represented by these forms was varied. Seven of the 44 (16%) of the forms were designed to produce a numerical score which was placed in a continuum to determine the employee's evaluation, such as a score of 81.5-100=Excellent. Six of the 44 (14%) permitted weighing of the evaluative criteria by the evaluator, allowing him'her to decide the importance of each criteria in relation to individual employees. On one form, the evaluator was required to plot the numerical scores on a graph to profile the employee's performance. About half of the forms (19/40) provided the guidelines, definitions, and purpose of the evaluation with the form itself. The remaining 21 (52%) did not provide this information for this research; however, such information could well be provided during actual use of the form. Two forms were the multi-copy, carbonless type, with one copy being filed, one for the employee, and one for the governing body. Employee and evaluator signatures were required on every form, as well as the obvious personal information of the employee (name, social security number, position, department, etc.) Eighty percent (32/40) of the forms provided space for future goals and objectives for the employee, all of which were mutually agreed upon by both employee and employer.

Conclusions and Implications

In any research, it is important to compare findings to those previously published. In comparing the current study with the 1979 study done by Nancy Van Zant,[33] several differences and similarities become apparent.

It is interesting to note that 13 years ago, in 1979 when Van Zant conducted her study, the most frequent interval of performance reviews was annually. In 1992, 78% of those surveyed reported comparable information. It may be concluded that annual performance reviews have been shown to be most effective; or perhaps, given the time constraints on evaluators, annual performance reviews are

simply the easiest to conduct.

This study revealed that most of the performance evaluations were conducted by immediate supervisors (78%), data that was in accord with Van Zant's study, who reported that supervisors were most often the conductors of performance evaluations. Can it be concluded that the immediate supervisor is the best man or woman to perform evaluations? Logically, it would seem that the immediate supervisor would ideally have the best access to information needed to perform evaluations. This conclusion is possibly a valid one to be drawn from the data presented in both the 1979 and the 1992 study.

Conclusions and implications can also be drawn from the examination of these evaluation forms as a whole. The majority of forms (63%) used some form of a graphic scale to evaluate employees. All of the forms provided space for additional comments by the evaluator. It may be concluded that the use of a graphic scale was perhaps an attempt to maintain objectivity and consistency in the evaluation process, while the provision for additional comments allowed the evaluator to mitigate or explain the graphic rating applied. If this study were to be repeated, the inclusion of interviews with both the evaluator and the evaluated might help to explain the effectiveness of the graphic scale rating.

Eighty percent of the forms surveyed also provided for the inclusion of future goals for those being evaluated. This statistic leads to the conclusion that there is a broader purpose to the evaluative process than simply assessing the past performance of an employee, or his or her management skills, and that part of the purpose of performance evaluation is indeed to "indicate areas for potential growth and development."[35] The embodying of future goals in these performance evaluations could also reflect that this is especially appropriate for management type activities, such a Management By Objectives, for example.

The variety of the formats represented by these forms may well reflect the attempts by libraries and library administrators to increase the effectiveness of performance appraisal, to "build a better mouse trap," so to speak. It can be concluded, however, that the plethora of forms and formats serves to substantiate Rubin's claim that "there is no one way to conduct a performance evaluation."[36]

This examination of standardized evaluation forms used in public libraries to evaluate professional librarians determined the following rankings regarding the presence of management skills, where "1" indicates most often present as a management skill, and "7" represents least often present:

1. staffing
2. directing
3. planning
   communicating
4. organizing

5. coordinating
6. reporting
7. budgeting

It may therefore be implied, at least for the 40 standardized evaluation forms analyzed in this study, that the order of these management traits presented above reflects the importance of these traits in the professional librarians evaluated. However, the absence of these management skills on the forms also implies that not all public librarians being evaluated are being appraised on their management abilities. This research substantiates the premise of this study that there are indeed certain management traits and skills that can be identified, summarized, compared and contrasted by studying the standardized evaluation forms. Further, however, this research also leads to the conclusion that management skills, as defined in this study, are not always an evaluative criteria in professional librarians. As evidenced by the statistics presented, the ability to manage, direct, plan and communicate are most often evaluated in professional librarians; the ability to organize, coordinate, report, and budget are least often evaluated in professional librarians. Not all management skills were consistently present in all the forms analyzed; therefore, it can be concluded from this study that not all management skills are consistently evaluated in professional librarians. While certain traits and skills related to management were identified, recorded and analyzed in this research, there is insufficient evidence to draw any valid conclusions concerning the management skills required of librarians to perform their duties.

More research is necessary to draw implications concerning the relationship between professional librarians and the presence or absence of management skills on evaluation forms used in performance appraisal of these librarians. From the research presented here, it is not possible to determine if library administrators are consistently and wholly concerned with the management skills of their professional librarians.

References

1. Stueart, Robert D. and Barbara B. Moran, *Library Management* (Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1987), p. 10.

2. *Performance Appraisal in Academic Libraries* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990), p.1.

3. Rubin, Richard E., *Human Resource Management in Libraries: Theory and Practice* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishing, Inc., 1991), p. 100.

4. Rubin, passim, p. 100.

5. White, Herbert S., *Library Personnel Management* (New York: Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1985), p. 130.

6. Moskowitz, Ms. M., "Performance Appraisal: A Review," *Technicalities* 5:2+ (July, 1985) p.2.

7. Moskowitz, passim, p.2.

8. Webb, Gisela, "Room for Improvement: Performance Evaluations," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 63:56-57+ (February, 1989), p.56.

9. Webb, passim, p. 57.

10. Dragon, Andrea, "Measuring Professional Performance: A Critical Examination" In *Advances in Library Administration and Organization* (New York: JAI Press, 1984), p.28.

11. Rubin, passim.

12. Dragon, passim.

13. Rubin, passim, p. 125.

14. White, passim.

15. Webb, passim.

16. Rubin, passim.

17. Oliver, John E., "Performance Appraisals that Fit," *Personnel Journal* 64:66-71 (June, 1985), p. 68.

18. Dragon, passim.

19. White, passim.

20. Hafner, Arthur W., and Brian G. Kibble-Smith, "Managerial

Responsibility for Employee discipline," *Library Journal* 113:41-44, (May 1, 1988).

21. Webb, passim.

22. Dragon, passim.

23. Rubin, passim.

24. Kelley, Charles, "Reasonable Performance Appraisals," *Training and Development Journal* 38:79-82 (January, 1984), p. 80.

25. Conroy, Barbara, *Improving Communication in the Library* (Arizona: Oryx Press, 1986), p. 41.

26. Oliver, passim.

27. Kelley, passim.

28. White, passim.

29. Webb, passim.

30. *Personnel Policies in Libraries* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishing, Inc., 1980).

31. *Personnel Policies in Libraries,* passim.

32. *Performance Appraisals in Academic Libraries,* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990), p.4.

33. Van Zant, passim.

34. *Performance Appraisal in Academic Libraries* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990), p.1.

35. Webb passim.

36. Rubin passim.

Bibliography

Anderson, A.J., "Ours is Not To Reason Why," *Library Journal* 113:57-59 (April 15, 1988).

Blue, Margaret., "The Repulsive Employee," *Library Journal* 113: 58-60 (April 15, 1988).

Conroy, Barbara, *Improving Communication in the Library* (Arizona: Oryx Press, 1986).

Dragon, A.C., "Measuring Professional Performance: A critical Examination" in *Advances in Library Administration and Organization* New York: JAI Press, 1984).

Driskell, Judy, "The Good Librarian," *School Library Journal* 36: 126-7 (September, 1990).

Futas, Elizabeth, *The Library Forms Illustrated Handbook* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishing, Inc., 1984).

Gruber, Harriet, "Personal-Personnel Relations," *Library Journal* 113: 59-61 (April 15, 1988).

Hafner, Arthur, "Managerial Responsibility for Employee Discipline," *Library Journal* 113: 41-45 (May 1, 1988).

Hansel, P.J., "Administration Perspective in the Evaluation Process, *North Carolina Libraries* 42:8-11 (Spring, 1984).

Kelley, Charles, "Reasonable Performance Appraisals," *Training and Development Journal* 38:79-82 (January, 1984).

Moskowitz, Ms. M., "Performance Appraisal: A Review," *Technicalities* 5:2+ (July, 1985).

Nelson, I., "Business Perspectives on Performance Appraisal," *North Carolina Libraries* 42:18-22 (Spring, 1984).

Oliver, John E., "Performance Appraisals that Fit," *Personnel Journal* 64:66-71 (June, 1985).

Performance Appraisal in Academic Libraries (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1990).

Personnel Policies in Libraries (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishing, Inc., 1980).

Riggs, Donald, *Strategic Planning for Library Managers* (Arizona: Oryx Press, 1984).

Rubin, Richard E., *Human Resource Management in Libraries: Theory and Practice* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishing, Inc., 1991).

Stueart, Robert D. and Barbara B. Moran. *Library Management* (Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1987).

Stueart, Robert D. and Maureen Sullivan, *Performance Analysis and Appraisal* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, 1991).

Taylor, R., "Employee Perspective in the Evaluation Process," *North Carolina Libraries* 42: 12-14 (Spring, 1984).

Vincelitti, J.P., "Improving Performance Appraisal in Libraries," *Library and Information Science Research* 6:191-203 (April, 1984).

Wheeler and Goldhor's Practical Administration of Public Libraries (New York: Harper and Row, 1981).

Webb, Gisela, *"Room for Improvement: Performance Evaluations,"* Wilson Library Bulletin 63: 56-57+ (February, 1989).

White, Herbert S., "The Education and Selection of Librarians: A Sequence of Happenstances," *Library Journal* 115:61-63 (October 15, 1990).

White, Herbert S., *Library Personnel Management* (New York: Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1985).

White, Herbert S., "Professional Librarians and Professionals in Libraries," *Library Journal* 116:74-76 (January, 1991).

Appendix I

Libraries Surveyed

Alabama
- Birmingham Public Library
- Huntsville-Madison County Public Library

Alaska
- Anchorage Municipal Libraries
- Fairbanks North Star Borough Public Library and Regional Center

Arizona
- Mesa Public Library
- Phoenix Public Library

Arkansas
- Central Arkansas Library System
- Southeast Arkansas Regional Library

California
- Kern County Library
- Napa City-County Library

Colorado
- Boulder Public Library
- Pikes Peak Library District

Connecticut
- Bridgeport Public Library
- Hartford Public Library

District of Columbia
- District of Columbia Public Library
- Library of Congress

Florida
- Lee County Library System
- Volusia County Public Library System

Georgia
- Chattahoochee Valley Regional Library
- Dougherty County Public Library

Hawaii
- Hawaii State Public Library System

Idaho
- Boise Public Library and Information Center

Idaho Falls Public Library

Illinois
Arlington Heights Memorial Library
Peoria Public Library

Indiana
Allen County Public Library
Muncie-Center Township Public Library

Iowa
Cedar Rapids Public Library
Davenport Public Library

Kansas
Johnson County Library
Kansas City Kansas Public Library

Kentucky
Boyd County Public Library
Lexington Public Library

Louisiana
Rapides Parish Library
Tangipahoa Parish Library

Maine
Lewiston Public Library
Portland Public Library

Maryland
Public Library of Annapolis and Anne Arundel County Inc.
Wicomico County Free Library

Massachusetts
Lynn Public Library
Public Library of Brookline

Michigan
Bay County Library System
Farmington Community Library

Minnesota
Anoka County Library
Saint Paul Public Library

Mississippi
East Mississippi Regional Library
Lowndes County Library System

Missouri
River Bluffs Regional Library
Thomas Jefferson Library

Montana
Great Falls Public Library
Parmly Billings Library

Nebraska
Lincoln City Libraries
Omaha Public Libraries

Nevada
Las Vegas-Clark County Library District
Washoe County Library

New Hampshire
Manchester City Library
Nashua Public Library

New Jersey
Atlantic City Free Public Library
Middletown Township Public Library

New Mexico
Farmington Public Library
Thomas Branigan Memorial Library

New York
Middle County Public Library
Schenectady County Public Library

North Carolina
Asheville-Buncombe Library System
Gaston County Public Library

North Dakota
Bismarck Veterans Memorial Public Library
Grand Forks Public City-County Library

Ohio
Cuyahoga County Public Library
Fairfield County District Library

Oklahoma
Pioneer Library System
Public Library of Enid and Garfield County

Oregon
Beaverton City Library

Josephine County Library System

Pennsylvania
Erie County Library System
Pottsville Free Public Library

Rhode Island
East Providence Public Library
Pawtucket Public Library and Regional Library System

South Carolina
Aiken-Bamberg-Barnwell-Edgefield Regional Library System
Spartanburg County Public Library

South Dakota
Rapid City Public Library
Sioux Falls Public Library

Tennessee
Clarksville-Montgomery County Public Library
Morristown-Hamblen Library

Texas
Laredo Public Library
Lewisville Public Library

Utah
Davis County Library
Provo City Public Library

Vermont
Fletcher Free Library
Vermont Department of Libraries

Virginia
Arlington County Department of Libraries
Roanoke City Public Library System

Washington
Kitsap Regional Library
Pierce County Rural Library District

West Virginia
Ohio County Public Library
Parkersburg and Wood County Public Library

Wisconsin
Brown County Library
L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library

Wyoming
Laramie County Library System
Natrona County Public Library

Additional Libraries:

Arkansas
Asa C. Garrett Memorial Library

Colorado
Arapahoe Library District

Florida
Selby Public Library

Idaho
Ada County District Library

Illinois
Bloomington Public Library

Indiana
Monroe City Public Library

Iowa
Des Moines Public Library

Kentucky
Bowling Green Public Library

Mississippi
Hattisburg Public Library
Vicksburg Public Library

New York
Mid Hudson Library System

North Carolina
Greensboro Public Library

Ohio
Medina County District Library

Oklahoma
Western Plains Public Library

Oregon
Deschutes County Public Library

Washington
Everett Public Library

Appendix II

Letter to Directors

August 22, 1992

Dear Director,

I am currently researching the traits and behaviors that are being evaluated in professional librarians working in public libraries serving 50,000+. Once gathered, this information will be analyzed and studied in an attempt to create a clearer picture of what management traits are being required of a professional librarian.

This survey is designed to elicit information on performance evaluations in your library and will be kept confidential. All identifying information will be removed before being used for this research. Please read the consent form that accompanies this letter for full disclosure details.

Does your library utilize standardized evaluation forms for professional librarians? If so, please take a few moments and fill out this brief questionnaire. I am also requesting a blank evaluation form. I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience.

If your library does not utilize standardized evaluation forms, please check here_____ and return this letter in the enclosed envelope.

Please return your response to this letter no later than September 30, 1992.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mary Jane Santos
Community Relations Coordinator
Delaware County District Library

(This consent form was printed on Kent State University letterhead.)

Consent Form: An examination of Standardized Evaluation Forms Used in Public Libraries to Evaluate Professional Librarians

I want to do research on standardized evaluation forms used in public libraries to evaluate professional librarians. I want to do this because I am completing my Master's Degree of Library Science from Kent State University, and this research project is part of that degree. I would like you to take part in this project. If you decide to do this, you will be asked to complete a short survey and provide a blank standardized evaluation form used by your library. Your involvement should take no more than 15-20 minutes of your time

Your responses will be kept in complete confidence. An identifying number will be placed on the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed with the survey, and after its receipt is recorded, the envelope will be separated from the survey and discarded. Please feel free to remove any identifying information from the evaluation forms that you will include. If this removal is not done by you, I will remove the identifying information and discard.

If you take part in this project, you will be helping to determine what managerial traits and behaviors are being evaluated in professional librarians working in public libraries. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time, without penalty.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at (614)362-3861 during the day, (614)369-7108 during the evening, or my advisor Richard Rubin at (216)672-2782. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. Eugene Wenninger at (216)672-2070.

If you choose to participate in this project, please sign this consent form on the next page, make and retain a copy of it, and mail the original to me, along with your completed survey.

Sincerely,

Mary Jane Santos
Community Relations Coordinator
Delaware County District Library

I understand what I need to do to participate in this study, "An Examination of Standardized Evaluation Forms Used in Public Libraries to Evaluate Professional Librarians."

_____
(signature)

_____
(date)

Please sign and date a copy of this consent form, include it with your survey and evaluation form(s), and retain the other copy for your records.

Mail to:
Mary Jane Santos
Delaware County District Library
84 East Winter Street
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Appendix III

Survey

Library name_____

Address_____

Name of Respondent_____

Title_____

1. Do you have a performance appraisal program in your library that utilizes standardized evaluation forms for evaluating professional librarians (those who have a Masters's of Library Science from a school accredited by the American Library Association OR those who are performing the duties requiring the equivalent of a Master's of Library Science)?

   a. yes _____
   b. no _____

(If you answered "Yes," please continue with this survey. If you answered "No," please stop and mail this survey to the address below.)

2. In a given year, how often is performance appraisal for librarians conducted with your staff?
   a. monthly ___
   b. semi-annually ___
   c. annually ___
   d. every two years ___
   e. other (please specify) _____

3. Who evaluates the professionals on your staff? (Answer all that apply.)

   a. library director ___
   b. peer evaluation ___
   c. immediate supervisor ___
   d. other (please specify)_____

4. How many professional librarians are on your staff? (Full or part-time -- include staff in branches.)

   a. (please fill in a number) ____

5. Is the evaluation performed with the standardized form accompanied by a scheduled interview with the employee, when both parties discuss the performance evaluation?

a. yes _____
b. no _____

6. Please mail samples of your standardized evaluation forms along with this survey and the consent form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to:

Mary Jane Santos
Delaware County District Library
84 East Winter Street
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding this project, please feel free to contact me at (614)362-3861 during the day and at (614)369-7108 in the evenings.

Appendix IV

Data Collection Form

The following form will be used to gather data from the standardized evaluation forms collected through this study:

planning -- working on in a broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them in order to accomplish a set purpose.

organizing -- establishing a formal structure of authority through which the work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated for the defined objectives.

staffing -- bringing in and training staff and maintaining favorable conditions for work.

directing -- making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as a leader.

coordinating -- interrelating the various parts of the work.

reporting -- keeping those to whom the librarian is responsible informed through records, research, and inspection.

budgeting -- fiscal planning, accounting and control.

(Chit marks will be recorded as each trait is noted.) Once this information has been gathered, it will be coded for statistical analysis, where 1=planning skills; 2=organizing skills; 3=staffing skills; 4=directing skills; 5=coordination skills; 6=reporting skills, 7=budgeting skills. Additional numbers will be added as different traits are noticed on the evaluation forms.

Appendix V

Completed Survey

Library name_____

Address_____

Name of Respondent_____

Title_____

1. Do you have a performance appraisal program in your library that utilizes standardized evaluation forms for evaluating professional librarians (those who have a Master's of Library Science from a school accredited by the American Library Association OR those who are performing the duties requiring the equivalent of a Master's of Library Science)?

a.	yes	42	95%
b.	no	0	

(If you answered "Yes," please continue with this survey. If you answered "No," please stop and mail this survey to the address below.)

2. In a given year, how often is performance appraisal for librarians conducted with your staff?

a.	monthly	1	2%
b.	semi-annually	6	14%
c.	annually	34	77%
d.	every two years	3	7%
e.	other (please specify) _____		

3. Who evaluates the professionals on your staff? (Answer all that apply.)

a.	library director	22	50%
b.	peer evaluation	2	5%
c.	immediate supervisor	34	77%
d.	other (please specify)	Library board, assistant director	

4. How many professional librarians are on your staff? (Full or part-time -- include staff in branches.)

a. (please fill in a number) ____

Range: 1-158; mean: 23.24; mode: 7; median: 10

5. Is the evaluation performed with the standardized form

accompanied by a scheduled interview with the employee, when both parties discuss the performance evaluation?

a.	yes	42	95%
b.	no	0	

6. Please mail samples of your standardized evaluation forms along with this survey and the consent form in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to:

Mary Jane Santos
Delaware County District Library
84 East Winter Street
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding this project, please feel free to contact me at (614) 362-3861 during the day and at (614) 369-7108 in the evenings.